

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-8 are pending in the above-identified application. New claims 7 and 8 have been added.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dubs and Tanaka et al. Claim 4 is amended to include,

... a first frame for holding a substrate of the plasma display panel...  
... a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame...

Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at Figs. 3 (a) and 3 (b).

Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a plurality of frames 2 (center frames) holding two substrates 13. That is, the substrate holder includes "...a first frame for holding a substrate of the plasma display panel," as recited in claim 4. Applicants' exemplary embodiment also includes a plurality of frames 2 (outside frames) having openings 4. (Figs. 3(a) and 3(b)). For example, the left-outside frame of Fig. 3(a) has an opening 4. The left-center frame holds the left substrate 13. Further, the center frame is situated adjacent to the left frame. Thus, the substrate holder also includes "...a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame," as recited in claim 4.

Dubs discloses a substrate 3 held by outer frame 20. Dubs does not disclose any frame adjacent to outer frame 20. That is, Dubs does not, disclose, "...a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame," as recited in claim 4.

Tanaka et al. discloses a plurality of frames 14 and a substrate 26. The frames 14 in Tanaka et al. do not hold the substrate. Rather, the substrate 26 is positioned under the frames 14. (Figs. 1 and 2). That is, Tanaka et al. does not disclose "...a first frame for holding a substrate," as recited in claim 4. Further, as shown in Figs 1 and 2, Tanaka does not disclose a second frame having an opening and adjacent to a frame holding the substrate 26 when the substrate is positioned under the frames 14. That is, Tanaka et al. does not disclose "...a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame," as recited in claim 4.

Applicants' claimed features of "a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame" may be advantageous over the prior art because vapors 38(e), which are provided to the bottom surface of the substrates 13 for forming a protective layer 18 during the manufacturing process, pass through the openings 4, and thus are not deposited on substrate holder 1. (Page 9, line 20 to page 10, line 1, page 11 lines 1-4 and Fig. 2). Thus, claim 4 is allowable over the art of record.

Claim 1, while not identical to claim 4, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 4. Thus, claim 1 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 4.

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dubs, Tanaka et al. and Patadia et al. Claims 2 and 5 are allowable, however, because they depend from allowable claims 1 and 4, respectively.

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dubs, Tanaka et al. and Hiroki et al. Claims 3 and 6 are allowable, however, because they depend from allowable claims 1 and 4, respectively.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al. and Tanaka et al. Tanaka et al. is described above. Homme et al. discloses a substrate 1 held substrate holder 200. (Fig. 7). Homme et al. does not disclose any frame adjacent to substrate holder 200. That is, Homme et al. does not, disclose, "...a second frame having an opening and situated adjacent to the first frame," as recited in claim 4. Thus, claim 4 is allowable over the art of record.


Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al., Tanaka et al. and Patadia et al. Claim 5 is allowable, however, because it depends from allowable claim 4.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Homme et al., Tanaka et al. and Hiroki et al. Claim 6 is allowable, however, because it depends from allowable claim 4.

New claims 7 and 8 have been added. Basis for claim 7 may be found, for example, in the specification at Fig. 6. Basis for claim 8 may be found, for example, in the specification at Figs 2-4.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/DDF/dmw

Dated: December 11, 2007

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

199710